

The insurance companies, those that deal with automobile insurance, have traditionally opposed no fault insurance. When no fault insurance was first promulgated the idea of it, the insurance companies, practically all of them, vigorously opposed this; however, now, I believe most of them favor it but simply from the standpoint of preventing Federal intervention.

PRESIDENT: Senator Duis, the Chair has had difficulty following whether you have been answering questions sometimes or whether you have been speaking on behalf of this motion or against it. I'm going to ask you to try to confine your remarks here, because I think--

SENATOR DUIS: I'll, I'll do better than that, Mr. President, I'll sit down because I do feel as though probably the powerful lobby has taken hold. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Very good sir. All right now, Senator Fred Carstens, did you wish to be recognized again?

SENATOR CARSTENS: Yes, I have, I want to call, Senator Murphy said I had misrepresented and I want to call his attention to page 21, section, subsection 4 rather, line 16.

PRESIDENT: Now wait till he, wait till he finds it, Senator Murphy--

SENATOR CARSTENS: Page 21, subsection 4, line 16 which is exactly what I said.

PRESIDENT: All right. Senator Stull, did you wish to be recognized on this motion?

SENATOR STULL: Mr. President,

PRESIDENT: Senator Stull

SENATOR STULL: --and Members of the Legislature, I would like to just make a statement here and I think most of you remember a little over two years ago my daughter and her family was in an automobile accident here in the City of Lincoln and it was necessary for them to hire legal counsel to get a settlement and the attorney that handled this matter for them figured out just how the settlement would have been arrived at under the law at the present time and what it would have been under Senator Waldron's bill. Now under Senator Waldron's bill which would probably have cost just as much money as we're paying at the present time, the settlement would have been \$7,790 less so I think that we should consider this when we pay the same fee for this insurance, we should look at what would happen if we had a loss and what the settlement would be; so I'm speaking against bringing this bill onto the floor at this time.

PRESIDENT: Now, is there any further discussion of the motion? Senator Waldron, do you care to close on you motion? Excuse me, wait a minute; Senator Nore, did you wish to be--okay, you're passing? Senator Warner, did you--all right. We're back to Senator Waldron and Senator Waldron now is closing on his motion regarding 161. Senator Waldron is closing, no questions after that. Senator Waldron.

SENATOR WALDRON: Mr. President and Members of the Legislature. You've heard some of the comments that have been imposed to it and you can see what some of the problems I've had. I, I guess it's probably my fault that I was not able to explain this bill more thoroughly to the Banking and Insurance Committee which still seems to be somewhat confused about the bill. The bill was never intended to cover property damage and it was pointed out at the hearing so that is not a factor here. It could include property